

NEW YORK HERALD.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR AND EDITOR.

OFFICE N. W. CORNER OF NASSAU AND FULTON STS.

VOLUME XIX. No. 115

AMUSEMENTS THIS EVENING.

BROADWAY THEATRE. Broadway—Isabel—To Paris and Back for Five Pieces.

BURTON'S THEATRE. Chambers street—Tempest is a Tempest.

BOWERY THEATRE. Bowery—Stage Struck Tailor—Black Dandy and his Friends—Pythias—Hot Cakes.

NATIONAL THEATRE. Chambers street—Uncle Tom's Cabin.

WALLACK'S THEATRE. Broadway—Nigger on the Moon—The Corners—Hearts at Fault—Milk and Honey.

AMERICAN MUSEUM. Afternoon—Alarming Sacrifice—Paddy Miles's Boy. Evening—School for Scandal.

CHRISTIAN AMERICAN OPERA HOUSE. 472 Broadway—Ethiopian Melodrama by CHRISTIAN'S MINSTRELS.

WOODS' MINSTREL HALL. 44 Broadway. Ethiopian Minstrel—Varieties of Uncle Tom's Cabin.

BUCKLEY'S OPERA HOUSE. 339 Broadway—Buckley's Ethiopian Opera Troupe.

ST. NICHOLAS EXHIBITION ROOM. 455 Broadway—White's Serenade.

BANWARD'S GEORAMA. 506 Broadway—Panorama of the Holy Land.

WHOLE WORLD. 37 and 37 1/2 Broadway—Afternoon and Evening.

JONES'S PANTOSCOPE—APOLLO ROOMS.

New York, Thursday, April 27, 1854.

The News.

We have given, in another place, a full account of the disastrous fire which occurred in Broadway on Tuesday night. Never, we believe, has the Fire Department of New York lost so many of its members at one time as it has on this occasion, and we trust that the fearful sacrifice of life which we have recorded will act as a terrible warning hereafter in the construction of buildings. That this melancholy loss of life was caused by the defective manner in which the building was constructed, a glance at the ruins will satisfy the most sceptical. The number of dead is estimated at from eleven to fourteen, and the number of wounded at thirty.

We give elsewhere further particulars relative to the trial of Mr. Ward, at Elizabethtown, Ky., for shooting Professor Butler. The respectability of the witnesses, the eminent ability of the counsel on both sides, and the high social position of the accused, the amiable character of Mr. Butler, and the tender sympathy evinced for his widow and orphan child, have combined to render this trial one of the most interesting and exciting in our criminal annals. The case was brought to a close on Friday last. An immense crowd gathered at the court house, not so much to see justice done, as to listen to the speeches of the lawyers. We have a full report of the evidence on both sides, which we shall print at our earliest convenience.

Our despatches from Washington are interesting, but we have no room for a more extended reference to their contents.

In the United States Senate, yesterday, a report adverse to paying Pennsylvania avenue with the Russian pavement was presented. A bill appropriating five thousand dollars to purchase the portraits of the first five Presidents, painted by Gilbert Stuart, for the White House, was passed. Friday next was appointed for the consideration of adverse reports on private claims. The Indian Appropriation bill was taken up. An amendment to pay Governor Gorman, of Minnesota, eight dollars per day while investigating charges against Mr. Ramsey, his predecessor, elicited a warm debate; but without coming to a vote, after an executive session, the Senate adjourned.

In the House bills were introduced making appropriations for the Post Office service and to equalize the salaries of Judges of District Courts. Mr. Bennett's bill coming up, on the motion to recommend Mr. B. amplified on its merits, but without taking the question the House went into Committee of the Whole, when the interminable Nebraska question was discussed.

The steamship Arabia, from Liverpool, arrived at Boston yesterday afternoon at 4 o'clock, making the run from Halifax in twenty-nine hours. Her mails will reach this city this morning. We give some additional intelligence brought by her under the telegraphic head. The America left Boston yesterday for Liverpool, with eighty-three passengers and over one hundred thousand dollars in specie.

Our letters from San Diego, published elsewhere, contain information of the Walker filibusters in Lower California. The expedition by this time has probably dissolved, and the intrepid but unsuccessful colonel, accompanied by a handful of friends, is now on the march for Texas, choosing to encounter the rapacious Indians and blood-thirsty Mexicans rather than throw himself on the tender mercies of his countrymen. The "New Republic" is among the things that are not, and it would seem that there are no terms of exorcism that may not be applied to an unsuccessful man.

News from the city of Mexico to the 18th inst. is received, bringing accounts of a fight between the forces of Santa Anna and Alvarez, in which the latter was routed. Great was the rejoicing, brilliant was the illumination, and solemn was the Te Deum, in the Halls of the Montezumas and thereabouts thereupon—but the story is regarded as a ridiculous Mexican exaggeration. The passport system having been put in operation in Mexico, the passengers of the schooner Arata, fifty in number, not having the necessary documents, were seized near San Blas, heavily chained—as the report says—and taken to the capital. Of the party twelve were Americans and four Englishmen.

We have received our files of papers from Costa Rica to the 1st inst. Nothing new has transpired since the date of our last advices.

An arrival at Philadelphia from Gonaves reports that hostilities were about to be resumed by Faustin I. against the Dominicans.

Transactions in produce yesterday were rather limited, as dealers were disposed to await the receipt of private telegrams by the Arabia. Cotton was firm, with fair sales at about a 1/2 advance in some cases on Monday's quotations. Indian corn, being in light supply, advanced about two cents per bushel. Good to prime Genesee wheat, with a light supply, was held at \$2 30 a \$2 40 per bushel. Flour was but little affected by the news, except that, stocks being light, holders were firmer. There was a little extra for grain purchasing for export, although freight rates were lower. There was a good demand for fresh freights from the British provinces to England, and two vessels were taken up, one foreign, at \$5 10, and the other American, at \$7 10.

The fifteenth annual exhibition of the school of the Mechanics' Institute was held at the Broadway Tabernacle last evening. The proficiency of the pupils was strikingly manifest.

In the Board of Education last evening, the President, who had previously intimated his intention of leaving shortly for Europe, was nominated a delegate from the New York Board of Education to the educational exhibition of all nations to be held in London next month. The propriety of sending models of books, schoolhouses, &c., to this exhibition was mooted, and referred to a select committee of seven.

The trial of Dennis O'Connor for the murder of Michael Conroy, took place yesterday in the Court of Oyer and Terminer. A verdict of "manslaughter in the second degree" was rendered.

Delegates from the railroad companies between New York and Montgomery, Ala., met in Philadelphia yesterday, to agree upon a plan for transporting the mails and passengers between those points.

A jury recently rendered a verdict of fifteen thousand dollars damages against the Worcester Railroad Corporation, at the suit of Mary E. Shaw, for injuries received.

The National Scientific Society met at Washington yesterday, and, after choosing Professor Dana, of Yale College, President, and otherwise perfecting an organization, adjourned for the day.

A violent gale visited the region of Detroit on Tuesday evening, causing much damage. Several vessels were seriously injured.

Progress of Infidelity in the United States.

The cause which has been recently showered upon the trustees of Columbia College would not perhaps be worth notice from the press, if the grounds of complaint alleged did not themselves call imperatively for comment. In the fulfillment of the duties of his office, the trustees have just elected a professor of chemistry in the room of the late Professor Renwick.

There were two candidates for the post; the gentleman who received the appointment, and a Dr. Wolcott Gibbs, an alumnus of the College. It was natural to expect that Dr. Gibbs' friends would feel somewhat annoyed at his defeat; though perhaps they would have consulted their friend's dignity and his interests better by submitting quietly to the misfortune. Instead of anything so prudent or so becoming, a crew of partisans of the worsted candidate have fallen tooth and nail on the College, on the trustees, and on all concerned in the election, and revenged their bitter disappointment in language both unclassical and impolite. All this, perhaps, as we said, would hardly have been worth noticing—unless it were as a fresh evidence of the fact that scholars like him are not proof against rebuffs—had it not been for one of the arguments advanced on the side of the vanquished candidate. His friends tell us that he is a Unitarian, and that it was on this ground that the trustees refused to appoint him to a post for which he was otherwise eminently qualified. His partisans further allege that the College charter forbids the enactment of any by-law or ordinance "excluding any person from any of the degrees, immunities or privileges of the college on account of his peculiar tenets in matters of religion"; and that the whole tenor of the laws of the institution are framed on a basis of universal toleration. Fearing these two propositions together in a syllogistic form, with more skill than candor or honesty, Dr. Gibbs' friends charge upon the trustees an infraction of the charter of the College, and a gross act of intolerance.

Of course it would suffice for the present to reply that until some evidence is adduced to show the truth of the assumed grounds on which the accusation rests, it amounts to nothing. The public has no reason whatever to believe that Dr. Gibbs' defeat was due to his Unitarianism, beyond the bare assertion of a few spiteful supporters of his. And it will be time enough for the College to take up the cudgels when the charge is made in a more tangible shape, and with a more substantial basis.

But if it were true, as Dr. Gibbs' friends assert, that the trustees of Columbia College had refused to appoint him solely because he was a Unitarian, the former would still need to establish some material points before they could arraign the Board successfully either on a charge of infraction of the law, or on an indictment for intolerance. It would, for instance, be necessary to furnish at least some presumptive evidence to show that the charter can be read in so latitudinarian a sense as to include infidels among those who were to participate in its privileges and immunities. We can easily understand how the framers of the charter under George II. desired to admit all the various Christian sects—Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, &c.—into the college they founded; but we should like to see some very unequivocal declaration of their intentions before we construed them as extending the same favors to infidels, pagans, atheists or deists. If Dr. Gibbs' friends could discover any such declaration, their charge of illegality would rest on a better foundation than now supports it.

Another point which they must establish before they can induce us to listen to their tirades is that a rejection of Dr. Gibbs on account of his Unitarianism would have been in itself an intolerant act. This, we apprehend, will be found a matter of some difficulty. If Dr. Gibbs had been rejected because he was a Methodist or an Episcopalian, or a Baptist or even a Roman Catholic, the act would obviously have been intolerant; but there is a wide difference between these sects and the Unitarians—so wide in truth, that we can only explain the sympathy felt for Dr. Gibbs in many quarters, on the hypothesis that the character of Unitarianism is very imperfectly understood among us.

In plain English, a Unitarian is one who does not believe in the Trinity, in the divinity of Christ, in the inspired character of the Bible—a species of infidel known by the generic name of Deist, as believing in one God, and thus opposite to Atheists who believe in no God at all. The most eminent Unitarian of past ages was probably Voltaire, who may be said to have laid the foundation of Unitarian doctrine in his philosophical works. All Unitarians have not carried out their doctrines as consistently as Voltaire; most of them have lacked the wit and the learning which rendered his blasphemies popular for a time. But none of our modern Unitarians differ materially from the sage of Ferney in their doctrines. They believe in one God or creative power; think the Bible an excellent work, inferior to Shakespeare, but decidedly better than Plato; and class Moses, Christ, and St. Paul among the eminent men of antiquity. In this State they are of recent growth. For twenty-five years or more, they have flourished at Boston and in New England. Most of the literary men have become Unitarians; many of the clergymen have adopted that faith; and doubters generally, shrinking from the stigma attached to the name of deist or infidel, have cloaked their unbelief under the disingenuous robe of Unitarianism. The church to which Mr. Gibbs belongs has been notorious for the receptacle for New England infidelity for a quarter of a century.

Now when a gentleman presents himself as a candidate for a professorship at one of our first collegiate institutions, and openly avows this form of unbelief, the responsibility thereby imposed upon the trustees is no light burthen. It is clear that no position in life gives a man such favorable opportunities for proselytizing as a professor's chair. It is obvious that the class of proselytes he will make will be precisely the most influential class in the country: young men of good family, liberal education, and generally with good abilities, whose future is in the word the future of these United States. The question therefore which under such circumstances trustees would be bound to decide would be whether or no they ought by any act of theirs to favor the spread of Unitarianism over this continent. It is hardly, in a strict sense, a question of religious opinions. A man may be a conscientious infidel, and yet, as many have done, object strenuously to the spread of infidelity among his countrymen. So an individual may respect and esteem a Unitarian without absolutely liking to give him a chance of converting his children and friends. And so, the trustees of a college, having to choose between a Christian

and a Unitarian, are not necessarily intolerant because they decline to place in the hands of the latter a power for mischief which may hereafter make the bulk of the American people infidels.

It is absurd at the present day to quarrel about creeds. Enlightened men can differ in every essential particular in their religious belief without being the worse friends on that account. But it is palpable that, at present, the vast majority of the people of the United States believe not only that Christianity is the best and safest of all religions, but that no other religion can secure either peace on earth or happiness in heaven. With this belief, they are undoubtedly entitled by all fair and moderate means to prevent the overthrow of Christianity; and when they see a glaring attempt made to engraft infidelity on our collegiate institutions, they are fully justified in frustrating it, and preserving to their children the faith on which they have themselves so implicitly relied.

On whatever motives it was based, the rejection of Dr. Gibbs will always be ascribed to his Unitarianism. As such it will take rank as an important event in the history of infidelity in this country. We bear no ill will to Dr. Gibbs; but we trust that his rejection may be the first of a series of checks under which the progress of infidelity in this State at least may be arrested for a time.

The Disaster in Broadway—More Fruits of Anarchy.

If anything will rouse the people of New York, the sight of the mangled corpses of firemen dug out of the ruins of Tuesday's fire must have induced those to think who have never thought before. So horrible a death, encountered in the discharge of one of the most arduous and noble duties that devolve upon man, cannot be contemplated with indifference by any. And if ever there was a proper and fit occasion for stern resolves and indignant rebellion against the system under which we live, it is now when we see clear as noonday, that the deaths of these men might have been averted by proper municipal laws.

The firemen who were killed and their comrades now groaning on a sick bed, would have been as hale and hearty young fellows as could be met in a day's walk if the government of New York had done its duty. Its victims they are; and they and those who have gone before them, like those who will follow after, were sacrificed to the spirit of mob law in force in New York. In any other city, the walls which fell and crushed Keyser, McNulty, Diegan, and McKay could not have fallen; nor the floors given way under which so many other brave fellows were mangled. In London, Paris, and other civilized cities, such disasters as that of Tuesday are foreseen and guarded against: walls of high houses are required to be so thick that they cannot fall in or out, and floors are built with sufficient solidity to sustain ordinary weights. There, as well as here, architects would economize at the expense of human life; but the laws interfere, and such a house as stood at No. 231 Broadway could not be built. The police would not allow a foot of such a wall to be raised or such a floor to be laid. Here, we have no laws that could secure us from such accidents; and when we see how the laws we have are executed, it is almost futile to demand further legislation. The awful catastrophe recorded in another column is only another fruit of the thorough demoralization which socialism, rampant license, and grogshop politics have wrought in New York.

There are those who, in view of the murders of Tuesday, call for some provision against the placing of safes in upper stories. Others suggest that the firemen should offer no assistance to a house where such accidents can occur. These remedies are of no use whatever. People will place safes in their offices if they please, in spite of ordinances to the contrary; and though it would undoubtedly be better that such objects should be stored in the cellar, men will not place them out of their own keeping if they can possibly avoid it. As to telling the firemen not to render assistance to a house, because the effort would be attended with risk, no one who knows the New York firemen would ever think of such a thing. Warnings would only stimulate their reckless daring.

If we want to hear no more of firemen being crushed to death at fires, we must build our houses better and more solidly. A house five stories high must be so constructed that the inside may be burnt without the shell falling in; and that the fall of one story will not necessarily precipitate all the stories beneath to the earth.

Even this law will be of no use unless the whole system of our city government is altered. To effect any serviceable reform we must begin at the root of the evil. We must first divest the people of all the authority they now possess in the way of electing subordinate executive officers. That we must place in the hands of the Mayor, who, with the slightest care on the part of the people, may always be a zealous energetic man. On him will then rest a double responsibility—first that of appointing efficient officers under him, and second that of seeing that the laws are executed. For, to us New Yorkers, it is a matter of far more importance to see that the laws we have are obeyed, than to enact fresh ones. Hitherto, our municipal statute book has been a dead letter; any one who chose might break any law he chose with perfect impunity. This state of things has grown out of the mob-law condition under which we have been living for the last twenty years. Bad men have engrafted upon our institutions socialist branches, called from abroad, or rather kicked out of every other civilized country on earth. These socialist theories taught that all power was and ought to be in the people; and as in all countries when "the people" are called for, no one answers but the rabble; all power in New York has been vested for nearly twenty years in the rabble. This rabble, being impatient of all legal restraint, has managed, by controlling all our elections, to defeat all our laws; and thus we now present to the eyes of the whole world a picture of unexampled anarchy. If we want to prevent the destruction of life at fires, or any other of the nuisances under which we now suffer, this is the only way to set about the work.

M. SOULE'S TRIUMPHAL PROGRESS IN SPAIN.

A ray of sunshine has fallen upon the gloomy prospects of Mr. Pierce's administration, in the shape of flattering news from Madrid. The Spanish government, says the telegraph, has made prompt reparation for the Black Warrior outrage. Before the government organ throws itself into one of those ecstasies into which the smallest piece of good luck now usually plunges it, we should like to know, in round figures, how many adult men and women in this country are expected to believe anything of the kind. Will the Cabinet be satisfied if one hundred men, of sane mind, admit that they

place reliance in the telegraphic announcement? Or could it make shift with fifty? Would it be inconceivable if only ten believers could be found? We hope not, for in the present condition of the public mind, we doubt whether the number of those whose credulity will at once accept the telegraphic news as gospel, would much exceed that of the righteous men in Sodom. It is quite easy to manufacture three lines of news in such a place as Spain, and send them on special to appear in the columns of the associated press of New York. Our Minister to Spain understands the business. He must have had something to do with newspapers in the course of his trouble life; for a better adept at the art of writing letters for the press, and producing impressions on the public mind through the agency of newspapers, we know not. It may be fairly taken for granted that all the Madrid correspondents of the British journals are welcome at M. Soule's table, and that they manufacture all the Spanish news that ever sees the light, that M. Soule himself manages all that portion which refers to his own embassy. News from Spain with regard to the Black Warrior outrage is almost certain to come from the American embassy direct.

Now, if we take into consideration the character, past history and future prospects of our Minister to Madrid, it will appear in the highest degree improbable that he has obtained reparation for the Black Warrior outrage, though quite likely that he is anxious that we should believe he has. M. Soule's political career in this country has been a series of accidents. He was smuggled into the Senate partly by accident and partly by mistake: afterwards smuggled into our foreign diplomatic corps partly by ruse and partly by accident. The whole country knows him to be an empty-headed, vain, unprincipled Frenchman; and under no combination of circumstances is there the slightest possibility of his ever attaining any sort of political position again. The last we heard of him was that he was rendering himself conspicuous by his attentions to the shameless Queen of Spain. Taking all these considerations into view, and giving him credit for the personal shrewdness he has displayed on one or two occasions, it seems quite as probable that he would turn the Black Warrior outrage to account for his own interests as for those of the country. He has nothing personally to gain by asserting American rights, his personal sympathies even being foreign; while a settlement of the difficulty on terms advantageous to Spain would secure him personal friends, and advance his cause with the Queen. We want some further evidence before we can believe that Spain has made the reparation we require.

Marine Affairs.

LONDON.—Mr. Edward F. Williams will launch from his yard, at Greenpoint, this morning at nine o'clock, a schooner of 280 tons burthen, of the following dimensions—109 feet keel, 28 feet beam; and 9 feet 6 inches hold. She will be named the F. Nickerson, and is owned by Delmer & Lotter, and intended for the Southern trade.

PRESENTATION OF A SILVER SPEAKING TRUMPET.—The passengers of the bark Oregon, which sailed from this port for Melbourne, Australia, in March last, on their arrival at their port of destination, after a short and pleasant voyage, presented Capt. Williams, with a beautifully chased silver speaking trumpet, as a token of the appreciation by the donors of his skill as a navigator and conductor of his ship and cargo.

CAPTAIN THOMAS E. HUGHES, in testimony of their high regard and admiration for his conduct, presented him with a silver speaking trumpet.

THE SHIP OSWEGO, Capt. Williams, which sailed from this port for New Orleans on Tuesday evening, returned yesterday. When off the Hook, a seaman named Robert Hamilton, being intoxicated, drew a bludgeon and stabbed Capt. Williams in the back, under the left shoulder. He was immediately put in irons and confined in a cell. The captain soon put him to bed, and he was removed to a hospital, and came up to the city in the steamboat Union, but is not dangerously injured. The vessel is the meantime has anchored off Staten Island.

City Intelligence.

REMOVAL OF WASHINGTON MARKET.—The Committee on Markets, composed of Messrs. Clifton, Cooper, Young, Reed, and Walworth, held an adjourned meeting yesterday in the City Hall, to hear parties interested in the removal of Washington Market to some locality in the vicinity of Gansevoort street. The chairman said that the committee had in its possession numerous petitions against, some in favor of the removal of the market to Fourteenth street to Gansevoort street, and one to the foot of Spring street. The grounds urged in favor of the removal, (according to these petitions,) are, that a market in the upper part of the city is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that it has been increasing for years, and therefore ought not to be removed; secondly, that it is a great nuisance to the numerous residents there—and Washington market, as it now stands, is too crowded to thoroughfare and is a disgrace to the city. One of the petitioners urged against the removal of the market were, first, that it is a long standing and well established business locality; that